

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/087,699 03/01/2002		03/01/2002	Kou-Joan Cheng	08919-074001	4883
26161	7590	11/15/2005		EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022				NAFF, DAVID M	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			1651	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• ,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Commons	10/087,699	CHENG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David M. Naff	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 At</u> 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-26 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any objection to the objection to the objection to the objection to declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application of the sective in the security documents have been received in the proceive in the security in the s	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/087,699 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

5

15

DETAILED ACTION

A response of 8/25/05 presented arguments and did not amend the claims.

Claims in the application are 1-26.

Claims 11-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 12/15/04.

Claims examined on the merits are 1-10.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Chen et al (AQ on PTO-1449).

The claims are drawn to a composition containing a thermolabile protein, which can be an enzyme, admixed with a liquor waste, which can be a sorghum liquor waste. The enzyme can be phytase as disclosed in the specification.

Chen et al discloses improving the thermostability of phytase by
20 mixing the phytase with sorghum waste liquor.

The mixing of phytase with sorghum waste liquor as disclosed by Chen et al results in a composition that is the same as presently claimed.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,699

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

Response to Arguments

Applicants urge that Chen et al is not a reference since Chen et al was published less than one year before the filing date of the present application, and that Tang's inventive contribution to the subject matter claimed was directed to a dry form of the composition. However, Chen et al disclose in Figures 1 and 2 mixing a phytase solution with dry sorghum liquor wastes (SLW) in a ratio of 1:10 v/w. Such a mixture will be considered dry in comparison with the phytase solution since the mixture will contain 90% or greater solids content and not be a liquid. The dry SLW has a drying effect since it absorbs moisture with mixed with the phytase solution and results in a composition having a lower percentage moisture than the phytase solution alone. Furthermore, in Figure 2, dry soluble starch is also mixed with the phytase solution to produce a mixture having a ratio of phytase solution:starch:SLW of 1:1:10 (v/w/w). This mixture will contain over 90% solids and will be also be solid instead of a liquid. Furthermore, for the assertion of Tang not being an inventor of some of the inventive subject matter described in the present specification, applicants should present a declaration signed by all inventors describing Tang's inventive contribution and the portion of the invention described in the specification that Tang is not an inventor, and limit the claims to only to the subject matter that Cheng, Huang and Chen are co-inventors. It is noted that the present application contains "Huang" as an inventor whereas the Chen et al reference contains "Hunag" as an author. Is "Hunag" a misspelling?

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/087,699

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

If Chen et al is removed as a reference for subject matter invented only by Cheng, Huang and Chen, Chen et al will still be a reference against subject matter that Tang has an inventive contribution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al in view of Cory (4,077,842).

Claims 2 and 7 additionally require the composition to be dried.

Cory discloses producing a dried stabilized enzyme composition.

For example, see claims 14 and 15.

It would have been obvious to dry the mixture of phytase and sorghum waste liquor disclosed by Chen et al to make the mixture more storage stable and reduce volume for transportation as suggested by Cory drying a stabilized enzyme composition.

Response to Arguments

Applicants assert that Cory is directed to drying a glucose isomerase concentrate and is silent as to any liquor waste being present. However, the glucose isomerase of Cory is a thermolabile protein, and it would have been expected the mixture of Chen et al can be dried from knowing that a glucose isomerase concentrate can be dried as disclosed by Cory. The presence of dry SLW with the phytase of Chen et al would have been expected to facilitate drying since it absorbs moisture and reduces the amount of water that needs to be removed. Furthermore, Chen et al disclose that the mixture of SLW and phytase provides phytase having improved thermostability, and being

Application/Control Number: 10/087,699 Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

thermostable would have led one to believe that the mixture is particularly suitable for drying.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,699

Art Unit: 1651

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10

David M. Naff `Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651

DMN 11/10/05